



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE EFFECTIVE IDEALS OF PERICLEAN ATHENS AND PISISTRATUS

BY SIR CHARLES WALDSTEIN

ALL human beings aim at, what has been called, self-effectuation. It is the realization of their capacities, aspirations, hopes, wishes, passions. The lower, the less developed the being, the less conscious; the higher the more conscious, is it of this motive to action. The range is thus: from instinct and appetite to clear purpose and ideals.

The same applies to societies and states. All states strive for self-effectuation, and in their relation to other states this leads to self-preservation and the positive manifestation of power. They again differ in the degree of consciousness with which they pursue this main motive of existence. The lower in organization and development the less are they conscious of this mainspring to political activity, the higher they are in the scale of civilization the greater is the consciousness of their political motive, until they adopt what is called a policy, a logical and reasoned system of action governing, dominating every individual phase of public activity. In their relation to other states the first impulse of self-preservation leads to a defensive policy, while the more positive impulse of self-realization may lead to aggression and an offensive policy. The two aspects often, if not generally, interact upon each other. The defensive policy, when directed against the aggression of other states, may naturally lead to an aggressive or offensive policy as regards other states; while the dominance of an offensive policy may not only strengthen the defensive aspect of national life, but may modify or determine the whole nature of purely internal, social, and domestic affairs in the lives of the citizens. It further leads to imperial and colonial policy.

But the degree of consciousness with which these motives

to national life act may be modified or regulated by a third aspect, which partakes, on the one hand, of a higher degree of self-consciousness, while, on the other, it implies greater self-detachment, until it attains almost a cosmical, and certainly a philosophic, character. This is the realization of an ideal for each state, ever present in the minds of statesmen and even of the mass of the people, toward which ideal, as a pattern of its civic existence, the state tends or consciously strives—the perfect realization of its national existence. Here again the height to which in the evolution of society a state has risen is measured by the degree of consciousness and effectiveness in political action to which each state has risen with regard to such an ideal of its national existence. The nature of this ideal is again determined by the leading motives in the lives of its leading classes or citizens, and the actual life interests of the people or the dominant element within the nation. It may thus be military, economical, commercial, even religious. Power, wealth, or the sway of its god or gods or priests will be the determining factor in its national ideal, the pattern or model of a state toward which its life as a state tends.

But the determining factor in the national ideal may be neither of these, though they may all be included in part or as means to a final end. It may be of a more spiritual nature and rest upon the ideal life of the best citizens, the highest collective spirit of the people as a whole. This highest life may be best conveyed in the term Culture, which determines as a final goal the life of the highest individual citizens and of the nation as a whole. The distinctive feature in the ideal of such a state—ever present and effective in the consciousness of its statesmen as a final goal toward which national self-effectuation tends—would be national culture. In its attitude toward other states—defensive or offensive, domestic, colonial, or imperial—this element will then always be the essential factor; and even if it does not lead to an antagonistic attitude toward other societies, it will at least be the chief distinctive element present in their national consciousness when they fix their own position as a political unit within the whole of human society of which they are a part. The distinction will be consciously drawn between themselves and the *Barbaroi*. The *Barbaroi* are all the people—even of the same race—who are not possessed of the same culture.

It is my contention that the introduction of culture as a practical and effective element—in fact, as the dominant element—into national politics was the distinctive feature in the national life of Periclean Athens, the unique characteristic of Hellenism through which its influence has persisted through all ages.

Thus the essential and distinctive characteristics of Hellenism may be defined epigrammatically as consisting of the infusion of culture as a dominant element into the actual social and political life of the ancient Greek people. In no period of man's history can the same be said for any state. If we review the leading states in man's history, those who attained to supreme power and dominated the world's affairs beyond the mere realms of their original country, we find that all aimed at, and attained, power—the rule of that state. This included actual military power to dominate the peoples who came under their sway, to regulate their lives in accordance with the ruling peoples' customs, the extension of commerce, and the acquisition of wealth. It may also have included the imposition upon the subjugated or contiguous peoples of the orderly social life, of the laws—and even the religion, which made up the more ideal side of their existence. This was the case in ancient Egypt, with the Jews, with the Assyrians, with the Persians, with the Roman Empire, and, in more modern times, with the great Holy Roman Empire down to the very threshold of our immediate days.

In our own days the collective, though far from united, peoples of the West, the representatives of European civilization, may be justified in drawing a hard-and-fast line of distinction between themselves collectively and the savage peoples devoid of all civilization; or even between themselves and those representatives of different races and color, whose claim to civilization may be chiefly based upon the elements which they have absorbed from European nations.

But the ancient Greeks drew a distinction between themselves and the *Barbaroi*, and these *Barbaroi* included nations contemporary with, and even contiguous to, themselves, who could never be considered by them nor by us as devoid of civilization, as we look upon barbarians and savages who in every respect differ essentially from ourselves in civilization. The real ground of this distinction, which the Greeks consciously drew between themselves and the *Bar-*

baroi, was based upon the fact that the power to which they, in common with all states in man's history, strove to attain, was immediately connected with, if not based upon, culture. It was the actual recognition of this distinction which became a political and practical factor in their national existence, the consciousness of being better than others because of the higher intellectual and moral standards in the collective life of the state and in the actual living of each citizen. I repeat: it is upon this consciousness that the distinctive characteristics of ancient Hellas rests; and this distinctive and conscious policy of the Hellenic people was attained in the age of Pericles and finds its most direct expression in the funeral oration of Pericles as recorded in Thucydides. There could, in fact, be no clearer statement of this policy in which he pointedly draws a distinction—in fact, establishes a contrast—between Greece and the rest of the world, and, with pointed implication, between the policy of Athens and Sparta.¹

"Worthy indeed of praise are they, and yet more worthy are our immediate fathers; since, enlarging their own inheritance into the extensive empire which we now possess, they bequeathed that their work of toil to us their sons. Yet even these successes we ourselves here present, we who are yet in the strength and vigour of our days, have nobly improved, and have made such provisions for this our Athens, that now it is all-sufficient in itself to answer every exigence of war and of peace. I mean not here to recite those martial exploits by which these ends were accomplished, or the resolute defences we ourselves and our fathers have made against the formidable invasions of Barbarians and Greeks—your own knowledge of these will excuse the long detail. But by what methods we have risen to this height of glory and power, by what polity and by what conduct we are thus aggrandized, I shall first endeavor to show; and then proceed to the praise of the deceased. These, in my opinion, can be no impertinent topics on this occasion; the discussion of them must be beneficial to this numerous company of Athenians and of strangers.

"We are happy in a form of government which cannot envy the laws

¹ No doubt this speech is primarily meant to raise the patriotic spirit of the Athenian people and is in so far partial in the praise it bestows upon the Athenian commonwealth and its institutions. But it clearly proves the ideal which Pericles held before his compatriots and the practical importance he attached to it as being able to urge the democracy, whom he is addressing, to definite political action by means of this ideal. The main point is that the difference between the private and political life of the Athenians, as contrasted with that of all other peoples, and more directly the Spartans, is the infusion of Attic culture into every aspect of their life.

of our neighbors; for it hath served as a model to others, but is original at Athens. And this our form, as committed not to the few, but to the whole body of the people, is called a democracy. How different soever in a private capacity, we all enjoy the same general equality our laws are fitted to preserve; and superior honours just as we excel. The public administration is not confined to a particular family, but is attainable only by merit. Poverty is not a hinderance, since whoever is able to serve his country meets with no obstacle to preferment from his first obscurity. The offices of the state we go through without obstructions from one another; and live together in the mutual endearments of private life without suspicions; not angry with a neighbor for following the bent of his own humor, nor putting on that countenance of discontent, which pains though it cannot punish—so that in private life we converse without diffidence or damage, whilst we dare not on any account offend against the public, through the reverence we bear to the magistrates and the laws, chiefly to those enacted for redress of the injured, and to those unwritten, a breach of which is allowed disgrace. Our laws have further provided for the mind most frequent intermissions of care by the appointment of public recreations and sacrifices throughout the year elegantly performed with a peculiar pomp, the daily delight of which is a charm that puts melancholy to flight. The grandeur of this our Athens causeth the produce of the whole earth to be imported here, by which we reap a familiar enjoyment, not more of the delicacies of our own growth, than of those of other nations.

“In the affairs of war we excel those of our enemies, who adhere to methods opposite to our own. For we lay open Athens to general resort, nor even drive any stranger from us whom either improvement or curiosity hath brought amongst us, lest any enemy should hurt us by seeing what is never concealed. We place not so great a confidence in the preparatives and artifices of war, as in the native warmth of our souls impelling us to action. In point of education, the youth of some people are inured by a course of laborious exercise, to support toil and exercise like men; but we, notwithstanding our easy and elegant way of life, face all the dangers of war as intrepidly as they. This may be proved by facts, since the Lacedæmonians never invade our territories barely with their own, but with the united strength of all their confederates. But when we invade the dominions of our neighbors, for the most part we conquer without difficulty in an enemy’s country those who fight in defense of their own habitations. The strength of our whole force no enemy yet hath ever experienced, because it is divided by our naval expeditions, or engaged in the different quarters of our service by land. But if anywhere they engage and defeat a small party of our forces, they boastingly give it out a total defeat; and if they are beat, they were certainly overpowered by our united strength. What though from a state of inactivity rather than laborious exercise, or with a natural rather than an acquired valor, we learn to encounter danger?—this good at least we receive from it, that we never droop under the apprehension of possible misfortunes, and when we hazard the danger, are found no less courageous than those who are continually inured to it. In these respects our whole community deserves justly to be admired, and in many we have yet to mention.

"In our manner of living we show an elegance tempered with frugality, and we cultivate philosophy without enervating the mind. We display our wealth in the season of beneficence, and not in the vanity of discourse. A confession of poverty is disgrace to no man, no effort to avoid it is disgrace indeed. There is visibly in the same persons an attention to their own private concerns and those of the public; and in others engaged in the labors of life, there is a competent skill in the affairs of government. For we are the only people who think him that does not meddle in state affairs—not indolent, but good for nothing. And yet we pass the soundest judgments, and are quick at catching the right apprehensions of things, not thinking that words are prejudicial to actions, but rather the not being duly prepared by previous debate, before we are obliged to proceed to execution. Herein consists our distinguishing excellence, that in the hour of action we show the greatest courage, and yet debate beforehand the expediency of our measures. The courage of others is the result of ignorance; deliberation makes them cowards. And those undoubtedly must be owned to have the greatest souls, who, most acutely sensible of the miseries of war and the sweets of peace, are not hence in the least deterred from facing danger.

"In acts of beneficence, further, we differ from the many. We preserve friends not by receiving, but by conferring obligations. For he who does a kindness hath the advantage over him who by the law of gratitude becomes a debtor to his benefactor. The person obliged is compelled to act the more insipid part, conscious that a return of kindness is merely a payment and not an obligation. And we alone are splendidly beneficent to others, not so much from interested motives as for the credit of pure liberality. I shall sum up what yet remains by only adding—that our Athens in general is the school of Greece; and that every single Athenian amongst us is excellently formed, by his personal qualification, for all the various scenes of active life acting with a most graceful demeanor and a most ready habit of despatch."

No doubt there is a before and an after to the Periclean age; and, though elements leading to this final consummation may be discerned beforehand and the spirit of that age in its full expression survived into later periods (nay, survives down to our own days), the fact remains, that it is in this age of Pericles that Hellenism, as we understand it, finds its full expression and retains for us the significance which gives vitality to the ideas it embodies throughout the whole of man's subsequent history down to our own days and, beyond all doubt, to all successive ages in the future.

No doubt, also, it is a mistake to think that Greece means Athens. We must always remember the important position held in the earliest days by Crete, by Argos, by Sparta, by Corinth, by Chalkis, and, subsequently, by Ægina; the cities and the islands of Ionia, especially Miletos, and, above all, by the centers of Hellenic civilization in Sicily and Magna

Græcia. In all these cities and states philosophy, art, and advanced political and social institutions flourished. It would indeed be untrue to maintain that all these cities and states were not representative of what we call Hellenic culture, and that they did not contribute their share to the making of that totality of civilized life with which ancient Greece is always associated in our minds. But there is no evidence that the conscious distinctive characteristics of Hellenism, which I have endeavored to define, forming the basis, and essentially modifying and directing the course, of practical politics, ever present in the minds of their statesmen, the leaders of their democracy, nay, the whole of the community itself, was the dominant factor in the life of these separate constituent parts of ancient Hellas. It was only true of Athens, Periclean Athens, Athens the leader of the united Greek states, which struck the dominant note in the symphony of Greek civilization so that the whole vibrates on through all times—the harmony of the spheres.

But it was only through the growth of power of Periclean Athens and through its actual leadership, its hegemony in the confederacy of Greek states, that this policy of practical culture could become effectively the ruling element for the whole of ancient Hellas. The consciousness, the conscious expression, of this political aspect of Hellenic culture was emphasized and made clear to Pericles and the Athenian people by the opposition of the other leading state of ancient Hellas, Sparta, with whom Athens had to struggle for that hegemony. It is not impossible or improbable that, if the antithesis to the Attic ideal had not been so clearly expressed and powerfully realized in opposition on the part of Sparta, the step to the conversion of such an ideal of culture into an element of practical politics might never have been made. A generation after Pericles, during the most acute phase of the Peloponnesian War, Isocrates formulates this most striking feature of Attic and Hellenic civilization in his great speech called "Panegyricus." Enumerating the achievements of Athens, he says: "For also the arts—as well those that provide for things useful in life as also those that are productive of pleasure—Athens has supplied for the other states, having either invented or improved them." He then enlarges on this point in showing that, not only athletic games are encouraged, but also intellectual and artistic pursuits, the splendid dramatic entertainments, the art of ora-

tory, philosophy, developing among the citizens thought and taste and refining the art of social intercourse.

The identification and actual interfusion of such a spiritual element with the physical and practical exigencies of political life was but short-lived. The coarser and sterner elements of physical power, and especially the internal dissensions among the various elements in a democracy, led to the downfall of the political dominance, the hegemony of Athens. But here comes the consoling feature inherent in the things of the mind and the spirit, in truth and beauty: that, having once been manifested and realized, through their tenacious vitality, they cannot be utterly undone; and, like the phoenix, they arise again out of the ashes in new forms and permeate and modify even that which may have been the physical cause of the destruction of their actual empire. Hellenic culture becomes an integral part of the robust and purely warlike life of the Macedonian Empire; and through Alexander the Great it is carried into the remotest parts of the ancient world, so that we meet with the influence of Hellenic art in the Far East among the remains discovered there in our own days; it becomes the cement which holds together the rough blocks from which the great structure of Roman society is built up in the time of Cæsar and his imperial successors, welding together the discordant racial and social elements of the Italic Peninsula, and, subsequently, of the discordant peoples all over the ancient Roman world. It is revived during the Italian Renaissance, and its leading elements still furnish us with that ideal of culture in our own days, which can never be dissociated from the Athens of Pericles.

No doubt when we study the complex and wonderful constitution of Athens we realize how, even in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., the constant and gradual changes in the administration of political life in this small community reflect the growth of their civilized and intelligent existence; until we come to that wonderful achievement in the constitution given by Solon, which in a singular manner seems to anticipate many of the political and social difficulties with which we are now grappling in our own days. No doubt also we must look upon Themistocles as the actual initiator of Attic Imperialism, which put that city in the position of claiming the hegemony of the great Greek confederation after the Persian aggressor had been driven back.

His patriotic and statesman-like zeal led him rightly to begin with the establishment of security at home and maritime power abroad. He might thus be considered the founder of Athenian supremacy. Without Themistocles no Pericles and no Periclean Athens. But I should like to add: without Pericles no Athens and no Hellenism as we know it. Nor must we forget what was done by Cimon in the advance of culture at Athens.

Even before Themistocles, however, the distinctive element which Pericles gave to the world's history was in some way anticipated; and this I hold was done by Pisistratus.

To put the case shortly: the two elements that had to be combined by Pericles into the actual life of the Athenian people and the confederacy of Greek states as an organic whole were culture, on the one hand, and, on the other, the power of Athens, which should make it the leader in a confederation of the whole Hellenic people. In a very interesting article recently published, Mr. Guy Dickins has shown how Sparta, under Chilon, the contemporary of Pisistratus, pursued a non-imperialistic policy which directly discouraged the higher forms of culture.¹ Scholars and historians such as Wilamovitz-Moellendorff, Meyer, and Busolt have maintained on strong grounds that there was a conscious Pan-Ionic element in the politics of Athens of this period. It is also clear that "Ionia" stood for "culture" as opposed to Dorianism even in those days. But I venture to maintain, that in the mind of Pisistratus Pan-Ionianism was conceived as a step to the wider conception of Pan-Hellenism, which he realized in a more embryonic form than the clear conception given to it after the Persian War in the Periclean age.

Culture is the pursuit of the things of the mind for their own sake. It thus leads to philosophy and science and to art in all its forms. But, in order that this culture should be evolved and grow and become efficient and practically potent as a leading feature in actual political and national life, we must have wealth—wealth as leading to the surplusage of energy and to leisure. So long as the individual man or a nation is driven to expend all energy in merely providing for physical existence there is no room for culture. As leisure implies spare time beyond that required for active work, and as leisure is essential to recreation, to play of

¹ *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1912, p. 25.

the body and of the mind, so we require a surplusage of energy which leads us to exert our energies in physical or mental play in all those occupations which are not directly called forth by the pressure of needs actually before our eyes. Necessity may be the mother of invention; but it is not likely that man can approach and solve the problems of higher mathematics and physics, or create great works of art, when the one thing that he must do is to make his spade or his plow, his flint arrow-head or hatchet or knife, in order to subsist at all. It is a most characteristic and singular fact that the ancient Greeks, who gave the world culture, were the first people who produced a system of athletic games as a most important part of their life. This could not have been the case if they had not possessed that surplusage of time, coupled with energy, which enabled them to *play*, to find satisfaction and pleasure in physical exertion and energy for its own sake, and in the production of things of the mind for the sake of their beauty and truth. In economical terms this means wealth.

The first requisite, therefore, was an economical one to produce this surplusage of wealth and leisure. This Pisistratus realized and endeavored to supply. By carrying on the injunctions of Solon he restored the national prosperity of the Athenian people by economical enactments within and, in the second place, enlarged the sphere by developing the foreign relations of economical life in commerce and industry. The extension of foreign commerce through colonization and the employment of Athenian capital (his own in the Chersonesus) led to the increase of the navy and definite foreign and imperial policy.

That he clearly recognized the need for the coalition of all the Greek states and, at the same time, entertained the hope that Athens should be the leader in this federation, is clear from the fact, that he used the two elements which should thus combine them in this sense. Pisistratus recognized that the most powerful factors to bring about such a federation, based upon the consciousness of national unity, were and always are, language and religion, including the traditions and customs of peoples with regard to their common past.

To begin with religion. The divinity which stands for the supreme national unity in the complex and confused polytheistic system of ancient Greek mythology is Zeus,

who became the Pan-Hellenic Zeus of the fifth century, really the creation of that age. It is significant that Pisistratus establishes and develops the position of this ruling divinity for the whole Greek people and began on a colossal scale the erection of the temple at Athens which was only completed in Roman times.

Thus in giving definite organization to the mythological system of ancient Greece as laid down in the Homeric poems (which have frequently, with some justification, been called the Bible of the ancient Hellenic world) he provided Greece with a definite national religion embodying all the independent local forms of worship and traditions into a more or less harmonious system, the Pan-Hellenic Zeus ruling over all supreme. He thus gave religious expression to the federation and unity of the Hellenic people on the political side. There is no doubt that he also desired to draw in the Ionic people, especially in the personality of Apollo, to whom he erected a temple. But within this system, corresponding to the aims which he had for the predominance of Athens within the federation, it is distinctly his endeavor to give marked prominence to the worship of Athene, who henceforth was to be markedly associated with the Attic people. There is evidence to show that in the earlier days Athene was an agricultural divinity of the Attic peasantry. In the time of Pisistratus, corresponding to the development of the Attic polity, she became the Panathenaic Athene, a most important figure among the Olympians of ancient Greece. It was he or Solon who first put the head of Athene on the coins of ancient Athens, and this archaic type survived for many generations after the type of the goddess had been beautified and ennobled by the great artists of the Pheidias period. Whether the story of his entering Athens with Phya from Pæania, disguised as Athene, is strictly true or not, it does indicate the close relationship which he strove to establish between his rule and this divinity, henceforth to symbolize the political dominance of the Athenian people.

It is he who builds the great temple, the Hekatompedos, on the Acropolis, the remains of which have been so ingeniously identified by Dr. Doerpfeld. This temple is to be distinguished from the Parthenon, which in the days of Pericles gave the clearest expression to Attic hegemony. The older (Palaios) Temple of Athene is confusedly interwoven with the Erechtheum and was no doubt built on the

site and joined onto the house of Erechtheus, as the cultus of Erechtheus and Poseidon are themselves mixed up with the cult of Athene. But it is significant to note that what might have been a kingly palace in the Minoan and Mycenæan ages, especially when democracy is for the time superseded by the rule of a tyrant, now becomes a religious and national monument in the temple of Athene. This marks the difference, which I have long ago¹ endeavored to make clear, between the *palatial* character of the art of the Minoan and Mycenæan periods as compared with the *national* character of Hellenic art in the historical period, the beginnings of which are especially associated with Pisistratus.

So also he developed this national feeling by that most important act of his, the editing and publication of the Homeric poems,² which became in this respect the most effective and direct means of uniting the Greek peoples among one another. On the other hand, the Homeric poems did not tend to support the Attic hegemony, which he had in his mind. As has been amply recognized by Homeric scholars, the passages referring to Athens and Theseus were interpolated at that time. It is especially in the cult and the development of the whole heroic story of Theseus, further consummated in the time of Cimon, that this conscious tendency on the part of Pisistratus is to be noted. It is again only in the age of Cimon and Pericles that this primary action on the part of Pisistratus receives full expression. It is only then, for instance, that in vase representations the favorite labors of Hercules are superseded by the exploits of Theseus. But it is with Pisistratus that the beginnings of this cult of Theseus, as the distinctively Attic hero, are made. It is easy to recognize how the personality of Theseus, his life, and his exploits are based upon, or modified by, the traditions concerning Hercules. This mytho-poetic process may even have arisen out of the

¹ See THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, March, 1901.

² Whether we hold the view of P. Cauer, who maintains that the Homeric poems were first put in writing by Pisistratus, or accept the refutation of this view by Rothe; whether we accept the statement of Cicero or explain much of all these traditions by definite machinations of Megusian writers (see the most recent interesting article in the *Classical Quarterly*, January, 1913, by Mr. T. W. Allen), it cannot be doubted by anybody that Pisistratus introduced the recitation of these poems into the Greater Panathenaic games, and that he did much to emphasize their importance as an integral part of Greek national culture.

anticipated rivalry between Athens and Sparta in that the Attic people desired to have a non-Dorian Heracles of their own. Yet there is no doubt that by pushing Theseus forward on the horizon of dominant heroic figures Pisistratus and his followers meant to give a religious or quasi-religious justification to their actual aims in practical politics. This, no doubt, was the universal method adopted in the tradition of the ancient world. To illustrate it in other spheres I need but point to the method adopted by Pindar in his odes, by Attic vases, prize vases—in fact, by the decoration with mythological scenes in so many great edifices of ancient Hellas. In Cimon's time Theseus certainly had an important temple dedicated to himself, though the beautiful extant temple, commonly called Theseum, cannot be identified with that building.

Pisistratus realized how language and literature and art were the most efficient means for instituting national unity and, in their turn again, for giving prominence to Athens as the central home of literature and art. The redaction of the Homeric poems was thus not only efficient in giving system and national unity to the religion and heroic traditions, as well as to the literary art of the several Greek peoples, but also in directly unifying the language.

We cannot exaggerate the direct political effectiveness and significance of these poems for the Greek peoples. Let me but point to one illuminating fact. The subjects chosen for the artistic decoration of the implements of peace and war as described in the Homeric poems themselves—for instance, on the shield of Achilles—are all taken from actual life and in no way from national mythology or heroölogy. These stories did not exist at the time in intelligible form; in fact, only these poems made them accessible and familiar to the Greek-speaking people. The works that have come down to us from the Minoan and Mycenæan ages are in the same way decorated with scenes of actual life, and in no way render mythological or heroic stories. It is only with the chest of Kypselos that the mythological and heroic traditions have so far become the common property of the Greek peoples so as to be utilized in art through the spread of these very epic poems which we call Homeric. From that time on these traditions became the source of all literary and artistic treatment. Not only in the metopes and pediments, on the vases and bronzes and terra-cottas, but in the great

tragedies of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, nay, throughout the whole of Greek literature, the mythical and heroic stories, as deposited in these poems, become the subjects for the highest manifestation of art in every one of its departments. The passages dealing with, describing, and praising the Olympian Zeus of Pheidias, directly refer to the adequacy with which the sculptor has expressed the conceptions which Homer forms of that divinity. When we realize the significance of these poems in their bearing upon the intellectual and artistic life of the ancient Greeks, we can realize, what Pisistratus saw, the influence which they would have in uniting the Greek peoples, and the political and social value of their actual publication and dissemination.

At the same time, by thus making Athens the literary and distributing center for the literature, the home of the libraries, he intended to make it the artistic center, the center of culture for the whole of Greece. That he desired to direct wealth into the channels of public, not of personal and domestic, art, was manifested by the erection for the first time in Athens of great temples on a large scale to which I have referred. I do not venture to decide whether the development of the cult of Dionysus and the erection of an earlier temple to him is to be ascribed to Pisistratus or his sons or a subsequent generation. As a less artistic, but important, adjunct to civilized life, we must also recall his gift to Athens of the magnificent improvement in the water-supply of the city by the construction of the Enneacrunus, of which the remains have been excavated in our own days. He consciously meant to make Athens the most beautiful and civilized city of Greece, an ideal finally realized by Pericles.

Lastly, it is important, in illustration of his policy, to consider his action in founding the Greater Panathenæa (Penteteris) in addition to the lesser, or yearly, Panathenæa, the origin of which was ascribed to Erechtheus and Theseus. The early Panathenæa also served as a chronological landmark by which the yearly offices could be measured, as the Olympic festivals served as a chronological division for the whole of Greece. Pisistratus, while no doubt recognizing the direct practical and political significance of the Olympic festivals as a chronological system for the Pan-Hellenic federation, tried to enforce the Panathenaic unity by adopt-

ing the division into four years of the Greater Panathenaic festival. It is an approach in mind to this larger spirit of federation, bringing the Attic people into an immediate relationship to it, which foreshadowed its political leadership. It is interesting to note how every step in the advance of the Attic polity is associated directly with this central festival, which originally had a purely political significance. We might almost say that the history of the Panathenaic festival marks, in its main lines, the history of the Attic people. It certainly was at one time identified with the Synoikia or Synoikysmos, which meant the closer unity of the separate Attic communities, tribes, and families, with the Acropolis as the local center and fortress. This step is again associated in Attic tradition with Erechtheus and Theseus, the founders of the Panathenæa and of the Synoikia. Pisistratus introduces the Greater Panathenæa and the recitation of the Homeric poems, while Pericles still further enriches the musical contests. Politics, religion, games, and art are thus all fused together to give predominance to the Attic state.¹ I have long since endeavored to show how Theseus becomes mixed up in this festival with Athene and her cult and how the political question of the growing sea-power of the Attic people affects the rites and ceremonies of Theseus and Athene. For the *peplos* of Athene, the dedication of which at one time formed a central part in the ceremonies of the festival, subsequently takes the shape of the sail on the ship which is dragged through the streets up to the Acropolis and is a survival of the Delian mission and the Thesean story, while at the same time it directly refers to the maritime element in the national life of the Athenian people.

I venture to hold that there is hardly any act of Pisistratus which does not tend to show, that there was present in his mind some conception of an Hellenic federation such as Pericles definitely attempted to achieve, in which Athens should be the leading state, and that this leadership, moreover, should be based on the superior culture of the Attic people.

¹ *American Journal of Archæology*, Vol. I., No. 1, 1885; and *Essays on the Art of Pheidias*, Note E, p. 253, 1886.

SIR CHARLES WALDSTEIN.